

controlling the heating elements that are in the die and therein causing at least one of the heating elements to heat at least one adjacent portion of the die. Applicant submits that the questions posed in the Office Action in connection with the §112 rejection would lead to more significant questions such as: Using the teachings of the prior art, how would one selectively control the heating elements that are thermally coupled to and in the die?, Using the teachings of the prior art, how would one form heating elements that are thermally coupled to and in the die? Applicant is unaware of any prior art that would answer these questions and, therefore, requests that the obvious-type double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to the §112 (2) rejection of claims 1-30, the questions posed in the Office Action can be answered by referring to the Specification, e.g., pages 7-8, which discusses a heating grid formed within the die with the grid being connected to a tester (140 of FIG. 1). The tester generates signals that exercise the grid elements and thereby cause the grid elements to generate heat. Portions of the die that are adjacent to the grid elements are heated by this arrangement and action. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the rejection and requests that the rejection be removed.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that each of the claims is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, along with a favorable response, are earnestly requested.

If appropriate, please charge charge/credit any additional, necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0996 (AMDA.477PA).

Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at 651/686-6633.

CRAWFORD PLLC  
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55120  
(651) 686-6633

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford

Reg. No.: 32,122